

Eden and distinct from the plants created on Day Three.

My conclusion is supported by the fact that different Hebrew terms are used for the plants described in Genesis 2:5 than are used to describe the plants on Day Three. This is a point in my paper to which Goertzen has failed to respond. Perhaps this is because the different Hebrew words certainly are inexplicable if the author of Genesis is trying to communicate that the plants of Genesis 2:5 are identical with the plants of Day Three (as Goertzen believes).

I find Goertzen's letter quite confusing, because it is clear that he has completely misunderstood my argument. In fact, he even suggests that I am saying that

*"plants designed for mankind" grew everywhere except his intended home — the garden of Eden and then they were transplanted there'.*

I am baffled by this statement because it is the exact opposite of what I am saying! I am suggesting that these plants of Genesis 2:5 were specific to the Garden environment and were not elsewhere on the planet (at least until mankind multiplied and spread out over all the Earth). Goertzen offers no quotes from my article that support his understanding of my argument.

Even though Goertzen disagrees with my conclusions, interestingly he never actually offers an argument for why my conclusions are in error. He simply asks some questions and declares, *'I don't think this interpretation will stand'*. Why will it not stand? Goertzen says that it is contrary to what *'creationists have always believed'*. However, this is simply mistaken. He has not documented such a statement and there are numerous exceptions, one of which is scholar H. C. Leupold in his commentary on Genesis, where he makes it clear that the vegetation in Genesis 2:5 is distinct from the vegetation created on Day Three.<sup>1</sup> In addition, simply noting that a view is unique does not necessarily make it erroneous. Goertzen has to offer more

than simply saying 'it's always been this way'.

Goertzen seems to have forgotten that his insistence that the plants of Genesis 2:5 were created on Day Three leads him to a chronological contradiction. Genesis 2:5 explicitly says that these plants required man to grow and therefore must have sprung up **after** man (as I have suggested). But, if the plants of Genesis 2:5 supposedly sprung up on Day Three with the rest of the vegetation, **before** man was created, then he is left in a contradiction. Therefore, it is actually Goertzen's view that is untenable if we wish to preserve Biblical inerrancy.

The only way we can be true to the text and at the same time avoid a contradiction is to acknowledge that the plants described in Genesis 2:5 are distinctive from those created on Day Three, because of the unique function they would serve in the Garden of Eden.

Michael J. Kruger,  
Mesa, Arizona,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

#### REFERENCE

1. Leupold, H. C., 1942. **Exposition of Genesis**, Vol. 1, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, pp. 112-113.

#### BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY

Dear Editor,

Dr Perry G. Phillip's article 'Humphreys' Cosmology and the "Timothy Test"<sup>1</sup> stresses the necessity of using extra-Biblical sources to understand parts of the Scriptures. In his reference 43 he says that

*'Thiele realised that a resolution to the chronology problem was not forthcoming solely from the Biblical material . . . Without reference to this extra-Biblical information it would be impossible to understand the Biblical text. . .'*

This is contrary to the impression I have of Thiele's work. He worked out the pattern of the Hebrew kings **without** synchronising them with known dates from Near Eastern history, and only synchronised the Hebrew kings with known dates **after** the problem had been solved.<sup>2</sup>

Philip Rayment,  
Pakenham, Victoria,  
AUSTRALIA.

#### REFERENCES

1. Phillips, P. D., 1997. D. Russell Humphreys' cosmology and the 'Timothy Test'. **CEN Tech. J.**, 11(2):189-194.
2. Thiele, E. R., 1983. **The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings**, New Revised Edition, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, pp. 16-17.

Dear Editor,

In reply to David Malcolm's letter concerning suffering and God's omnipotence and goodness I would offer Wilder-Smith's **Is This a God of Love?** His answer boils down to this: God did not create a race of androids but of people possessing free will in order to **choose** to serve God out of love for Him. There necessarily must be other choices available than good alone to have genuine free will. It is also true that our sufferings are *'but for a moment'* in view of eternity and will secure for us everlasting rewards and joy.

It was also great to see John Osgood writing again — even if only a book review! I believe his series of papers in the first three volumes of this journal, along with the earlier work on the date of the Flood from **Ex Nihilo, 4:1**, contain the most accurate Biblical chronology. He places the Flood at 2304 BC, the dispersion at Babel at 2200 BC, pre-Dynastic Egypt ca 2150 BC, the Exodus at 1447 BC, the Conquest of Canaan by Israel at 1407 BC, and the laying of the foundation of Solomon's temple at 967 BC. It would be great to have him and others build on this foundation to

provide creationists with a complete reconstruction of archaeology.

John Kaplan,  
Pawtucket, Rhode Island,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

### CAINAN OF LUKE 3:36

Dear Editor,

In **The Genesis Flood** (Appendix II)<sup>1</sup> eight reasons are given for not accepting the chronology of Genesis 11, seven of which are irrelevant. The one which looks as if it may contain some substance is (2), regarding Cainan of Luke 3:36. The authors concede that it is only their conclusion that

*'the Septuagint does give us the full list of names as they appeared in the original Hebrew text: but since the years for these patriarchs as given in the Septuagint are obviously false, we have no way of determining how old Cainan was at the birth of his first son. Thus, this one omission, even if there are no others, makes it impossible to date the Flood.'* (p. 475)

The footnote gives an impressive list of the ancient versions of Genesis which omit Cainan at the appropriate place, virtually demolishing the authenticity of their argument! One source cited in favour of including Cainan between Arpachshad and Shelah is the apocryphal book of Jubilees.<sup>2</sup>

In the **Apocrypha and Pseudopigrapha** translated by R. H. Charles (1913), Jubilees 8:1-5 mentions Kainam as the son of Arpachshad by Raseuja, daughter of Susan, daughter of Elam. Arpachshad taught Kainam the art of writing; at some stage Kainam

*found a writing which former generations had carved on the rock, and he read what was*

*thereon, and he transcribed it and sinned owing to it; for it contained the teaching of the Watchers in accordance with which they used to observe the omens of the sun and moon and stars in all the signs of heaven. And he wrote it down and said nothing regarding it; for he was afraid to speak to Noah about it lest he should be angry with him on account of it' (the Watchers being the sons of God in Genesis 6:12).*

Extra-Scriptural legends such as those in Jubilees and other apocryphal books are at least dubious. This particular one about Kainam was incorporated in the Septuagint Genesis account by inserting him in the Messianic line between Arpachshad and Shelah as Cainan, from where, presumably, Luke recorded him in Christ's ancestry.

Whitcomb and Morris are to be commended in urging moderation when extending the past by inserting unspecified numbers of phantom patriarchs into the Genesis genealogies. However, this red herring of Cainan's absence from Genesis, which they seem to have originated, has ever since been regurgitated by one author after another.

It seems incredible that qualified scientists who accept the Scriptural revelation of the creation of the universe in six days can stumble over the straightforward chronology in Genesis 11 (Hebrew text).

### REFERENCE

1. Whitcomb, J. C. and Morris, H. M., 1961. **The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications**, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
2. The books of Jubilees and Enoch are from the same religious tradition. Jude 14, 15 appear to be a quote from Enoch 1:9; the traditional orthodox explanation is that Jude was not quoting this book but both refer to a common tradition. This may be the case for the Kainam of Jubilees and Luke's Cainan.

Derel Briarley,  
Newcastle upon Tyne,  
ENGLAND.

### ARCHAEOLOGY AND CHRONOLOGY

Dear Editor,

The articles in **CEN Tech. J.**, 11(1) by John Osgood and Ralph Pacini concerning the history of ancient Egypt as it relates to the Bible prompt me to recommend reading the book **Centuries of Darkness**, which though not a Christian publication is fair.<sup>1</sup>

As background to what I wish to say, Immanuel Velikovsky must be first mentioned. His 1950 **Worlds in Collision** earned the wrath of scientists through his proposal that Venus began as a comet expelled from Jupiter in historical times, causing geological and environmental disasters as it approached the Earth. His astronomical scenario fouled academic opinion against what he subsequently proposed in **Earth in Upheaval** (catastrophic geology) and in **Ages in Chaos** (a reconstruction of ancient Egyptian and Palestinian history which agreed with the Biblical account rather than the generally accepted saga).

There seems always to have been a cynical attitude among the public towards psychiatrists, and Velikovsky's having been such was played upon by his critics. This attitude he related to II Peter 3:4-7 in his final book, **Mankind in Amnesia**, published after his death in 1979. Ironically, the following year Alvarez' ideas about dinosaur extinction opened the floodgates to the respectability of cosmic catastrophes, doubtless because the dinosaur extinction supposedly happened millions of years before the time of man.<sup>2</sup>

In 1982 British astronomers Victor Clube and Bill Napier in **The Cosmic Serpent**<sup>3</sup> connected the mass extinctions scattered throughout the fossil record to such events as comets or meteors striking the Earth.<sup>4</sup> The book also touched upon ancient history, especially of Egypt, and here the case was taken up by **Centuries of Darkness**.